

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-22, 26-39 and 44-46 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 21 and 46 are independent.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 11, 21, 22, 30, and 46 are amended. No new matter is involved. Support for the feature “the advance screen saver warning time is less than or equal to the screen saver standby time,” found in the amended independent claims, is clearly supported by Applicant’s originally filed disclosure (for example in Applicant’s Fig. 3). Further, in this regard, Tx, which is clearly shown in Fig. 3, is defined in paragraph [0025] of this application, as filed, as a screen saver standby time, and Ty, which is clearly shown in Fig. 3, is defined in paragraph [0025] of this application, as a screen saver advance warning time.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference(s) supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 23, 2010 and March 18, 2010, and for providing Applicant with an initialed copy of the PTO-SB08 forms filed therewith.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 11, 21, 22, 30 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failure to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the language “activating an advance screen saver warning before activating a screen saver if the screen saver time is different than a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time” contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such away as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant states that the specification discloses that the screen saver warning is activated if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time, referencing paragraph [0012] of Applicant's patent application publication.

Applicant respectfully submits that the language "if the current system idle time is different than a time difference. . ." clearly is supported by the specification language "if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference. . ."

Logically, if a screen saver time is greater than or equal to a time difference, it is clearly different than that time difference.

Accordingly, the claims under rejection clearly are supported by paragraph [0012] of the printed publication of Applicant's patent application.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-12, 14-22, 26, 28-37 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over SANYO Multimedia Projector PLV-70 Owner's Manual (hereinafter Sanyo) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0191960 to Hung-yi.

Claims 8, 27, 38, 39, 44 and 45 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanyo and Hung-yi in view of U.S. patent 5,153,580 to Pollack.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Applicant respectfully submits that, by referencing the Sanyo Manual in the Office Action dated November 10, 2009, the Examiner has conceded that Hyung-yi does not teach **predetermining a screen saver standby time and an advance screen saver warning time**. The need to reference the Sanyo Manual also establishes that Hyung-yi does not teach **activating an advance screen saver warning before activating a screen saver if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time**.

The Sanyo Manual allegedly describes the features available on the Sanyo PLV-70 projector. One of the features cited by the Office Action is the Power Management feature that alerts a user that if the projector is not being used “for a certain period” it will shut off if an input is not detected (p. 37). It is further detailed that the “certain period” of time is set to 5 minutes by default (p. 37, step 1). The Power Management feature further displays a “No Signal” message as well as a count-down clock indicating that the projector will power off within the projected time limit, as indicated on the count-down clock, if no input is detected.

With respect to the recited claims, there are two elements that require emphasis. The first is the **screen saver standby time** which is a predetermined value that defines how long a period of inactivity is allowed to pass before a screen saver operation is commenced. The second is the **advance screen saver warning time** which is a predetermined value that defines how long the advance screen saver warning will be issued for, immediately prior to the screen saver commencement, before the actual screen saver operation is commenced. These two elements are related in the claims as follows: **current idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time**.

The above two elements, and their relationship to each other, help to detail how Sanyo only teaches a single predetermined time period feature, which is to be contrasted with the two predetermined time period features recited in the claims. The Office Action asserts that Sanyo teaches essentially all of the elements in independent claims 1, 21 and 46 except for the screen saver, which is said to be taught by Hung-yi. However, Sanyo only teaches a single “certain period of time” during which a warning message is displayed informing a user about an imminent projector shut down due to inactivity. In contrast, the claims recite two distinct time periods that are predetermined, i.e., the **screen saver standby time** and the **advance screen saver warning time**.

The Office Action essentially admits that Sanyo only teaches a single predetermined time period when it writes “the advance screen saver warning time is set to 5 minutes and the screen saver standby time can be the same as the advance screen saver warning time” (bottom of p.4) (Emphasis added). It should be noted that the Office Action is required to teach each and every element recited in the claims when making an obviousness type rejection. Therefore, the Office

Action cannot simply look to the single predetermined time period (“certain time period/5 minutes”) found in Sanyo to teach the two distinct time periods recited in the claims.

In addition, because the outstanding Office Action does not detail how Sanyo teaches the distinct elements of the **screen saver standby time** and the **advance screen saver warning time**, it therefore follows that Sanyo cannot teach the limitation pertaining to the relationship between the two predetermined time periods mentioned above (i.e. **current idle time is greater than or equal to ...**).

To even further highlight the shortcomings of Sanyo regarding the **screen saver standby time** and the **advance screen saver warning time**, the independent claims have been amended to include the relationship that **the advance screen saver warning time is less than or equal to the screen saver standby time**. Sanyo simply fails to teach or suggest that positively recited feature, or any analogous feature, ultimately because Sanyo only teaches a single predetermined time period.

Applicant respectfully submits that the applied art must disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious each and every feature of the recited claims when making an obviousness type rejection of the claims. Clearly the combination of Sanyo in view of Hung-yi fails to do so. Therefore we believe, at least for this reason, the claims patentably define over the applied art, and appear to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Because the remaining reference cited by the Examiner has not been utilized to reject the claims, but has merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert J. Webster, Registration No. 46472 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: August 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David A. Bilodeau

Registration No.: 42325

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000